

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- TOWN & COUNTRY LINEN CORP. and TOWN & COUNTRY HOLDINGS, INC., Plaintiffs, -v- INGENIOUS DESIGNS LLC, JOY MANGANO, and HSN, INC., Defendants. -----	<p>X : : : X</p>
--	--

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #: _____
DATE FILED: 07/18/2022

LEWIS J. LIMAN, United States District Judge:

The letter motions to seal at Dkt. Nos. 347, 356, 361, 386, 391, and 403 are granted in part and denied in part.

The requests in Dkt. Nos. 347, 356, 361, and 386 to redact information related to Factory Trade Secret 2 are granted, limited to the specific information pertaining to Factory Trade Secret 2 in the documents at Dkt. Nos. 349, Ex. A; 349, Ex. E; Dkt. No. 353; Dkt. No. 354, Ex. E; Dkt. No. 354, Ex. H; Dkt. No. 354, Ex. K; Dkt. No. 354, Ex. L; Dkt. No. 354, Ex. O; Dkt. No. 354, Ex. R; Dkt. No. 383, Ex. 10; and Dkt. No. 383, Ex. 11.

The requests in Dkt. No. 356 to redact information in Dkt. No. 348 are denied.

The requests in Dkt. Nos. 356, 361, 381, 391 to redact information relating to the parties' financial information and internal business strategies that have not been publicly disclosed are granted where that information is sufficiently specific but denied where the information is general. Accordingly, the request in Dkt. No. 356 to redact financial information in Dkt. No. 349, Ex. A is granted. The request in Dkt. No. 356 to redact financial information in Dkt. No. 349, Ex. F is granted as to the information in ¶¶ 81, 118, 163, 164, n.249, n.254, and Schs. 1, 3, 3.1, 4, 5, 7, but denied as to the information in ¶¶ 120, 121, 122, 158, 180. The request in Dkt. No. 356 to redact financial information in Dkt. No. 349, Ex. F is granted. The request in Dkt. No. 356 to redact financial information in Dkt. No. 349, Ex. G is granted as to the information in n.22, n.26, n.27, Table 1, Schs. 15, 16, 17, 25. The request in Dkt. No. 356 to redact financial information in Dkt. No. 349, Ex. Y is granted. The request in Dkt. No. 356 to redact financial information in Dkt. No. 349, Ex. AA is denied. The request in Dkt. No. 356 to redact financial information in Dkt. No. 349, Ex. BB is denied. The request in Dkt. No. 356 to redact in full Dkt. No. 349, Ex. EE is denied. The request in Dkt. No. 361 to redact financial information in Dkt. No. 354, Ex. E is granted as to the information in ¶¶ 45, 46, 109, 110—with the exception of the first sentence sought to be redacted, as to which the request is denied, 138, and 161, and Exs. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 7.1, 7.1.1, 7.2, 9, 10, 14.2, 25, and 26, and n.137 and denied as to the information in ¶¶ 56, 63, 65,

66, 181, 187, 204, 218, 220, 221, 228, 229, and 231, and n.172, n.200, n.328, n.365, and n.417. The request in Dkt. No. 361 to redact financial information in Dkt. No. 354, Ex. F is granted as to the information in ¶¶ 30, 37, and Exs. 27.1, 28.1, and 28.1A. The request in Dkt. No. 361 to redact financial information in Dkt. No. 347, Ex. G is granted as to the information in Figure 1 and Exs. 31, 33. The request in Dkt. No. 386 to redact financial information in Dkt. No. 384, Ex. 8 is granted as to the information in ¶¶ 17, 28, 34, n.29, Figure 12A, Exs. 2, 5, 7, 10A. The request in Dkt. No. 391 to redact financial information in Dkt. No. 381, Ex. C, at page 130 is granted. The request in Dkt. No. 391 to redact financial information in Dkt. No. 381, Ex. D at page 197 is granted.

The requests in Dkt. Nos. 347, 356, 361 to redact information related to third parties Earthbound and DuPont are denied.

The request in Dkt. No. 356 to redact excerpts from the deposition testimony of Dr. Adanur in Dkt. No. 349, Ex. Q, is denied.

The request in Dkt. No. 391 to seal information in Dkt. No. 381-1 relating to the rates charged by Defendants' expert is denied.

The request in Dkt. No. 403 to seal the home address of Plaintiffs' expert in Dkt. No. 402, Ex. V is granted.

The requests in Dkt. No. 361 to seal Dkt. Nos. 354, Ex. K and 354, Ex. L in their entirety, the requests by Defendants in Dkt. No. 386 to seal Dkt. Nos. 383, Ex. 10 and 383 Ex. L in their entirety, and the requests by Plaintiffs in Dkt. No. 386 to seal large portions of Dkt. Nos. 383, Ex. 10 and 383, Ex. 11 are denied. The parties have not made a showing why the entire exhibits or significant portions thereof should be sealed. The parties may refile a motion to seal by August 1, 2022, identifying with specificity the financial and costing information within those documents that has continued relevance in 2022 that they wish to redact; if they do not do so, the exhibits must be filed on the public docket, with only the information relevant to Factory Trade Secret 2 and the financial information in Dkt. No. 383, Ex. 10 identified with blue highlighting by Plaintiffs redacted.

The parties are directed to refile all the underlying documents on the public docket, including the documents which the parties have stated no longer need to be sealed, by August 1, 2022, redacting only the information approved in this Order.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to close the motions at Dkt. Nos. 347, 356, 361, 386, 391, and 403.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 18, 2022
New York, New York



LEWIS J. LIMAN
United States District Judge